

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **February 24, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-7, 10-16, and 19-25. Claims 1-6, 10-15, and 19-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer et al (USPN 6,138,120, hereinafter "Gongwer") in view of Alegre et al. (USPN 6,199,113, hereinafter "Alegre"). Claims 7, 16, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer in view of Alegre as applied to claims 5, 14 and 24 above, in further view of Chatterjee et al. (USPN 6,243,751, hereinafter "Chatterjee").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being unpatentable over Gongwer in view of Alegre. Applicant respectfully points out that Gongwer teaches a **server that can be shared between multiple independent clients** (see Gongwer, Abstract and FIG. 1).

In contrast, the present invention is directed to a system that allows a **given application client to share a security context** through multiple application sessions (see FIG. 1, indexes 103 and 108 and page 12, lines 1-24 of the instant application). Allowing a given application client to share a security context through multiple application sessions is beneficial because it allow the given application client to access multiple applications while entering security information a single time. Note that the combined system of Gongwer and Alegre does not teach or suggest looking up a security context based on a client identifier and only allowing applications associated with the given client and not applications associated with other clients to receive the security context for the given client.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention allows a **given application client to share a security context** through multiple application sessions. These amendments find


support in FIG. 1, indexes 103 and 108 and on page 12, lines 1-24 of the instant application. Dependent claims 4-5, 13-14, and 22-23 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-16, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-25, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: March 25, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665